

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 and 22-37 remain active in this case, Claims 1, 28, 29 and 30 having been amended and Claim 21 canceled by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to a method; Claims 1-7, 9-27 and 30-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Banks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,674,449, hereinafter “Banks”) in view of Tsunoda (U.S. Patent No. 7,315,755) and in further view of Babula et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,353,445, hereinafter “Babula”) and still in further view of Matsumoto et al. (JP No. 2001-149354, hereinafter “Matsumoto”); Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Banks in view of Tsunoda and in further view of Babula; Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Banks in view of Tsunoda; and Claims 8 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Banks in view of Tsunoda and in further view of Babula and still in view of Matsumoto.

In response to the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of Claim 29, Claim 29 has been amended to define the method as being --used by a server-- and thus tied to a particular machine. Further, Claim 29 has been further amended to state the server functionality formerly stated in Claim 21, clarified to refer to a --recommended photographing protocol--. Accordingly, in view of these changes, amended Claim 29 is believed to define statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101 and the outstanding ground for rejection on that basis is believed to have been overcome.

In light of the remaining grounds for rejection, Claims 1, 28 and 30 have also been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 21 clarified to refer to a --recommended photographing protocol--. No new matter has been added.

Briefly recapitulating, Applicants' invention relates to a medical image diagnostic system wherein a group of examination protocols including a recommended photographing protocol for each region to be examined is prepared and distributed when a region to be diagnosed is specified as the request condition. This feature and the advantage obtained therefrom are described in the specification, page 15, line 23 through page 16, line 12 as follows:

...the photographing protocol is correlated with a single examination protocol in the above configuration. However, a method of correlating the photographing protocol to a plurality of examination protocols, such as those for the head, chest, and abdomen, as shown in FIG. 4A and FIG. 4B, is adopted in combination with the configuration described above. According to this method, by merely choosing an examination protocol for a target region to be examined, options are narrowed down to the least necessary photographing protocols correlated with the selected examination protocol. A list of the narrowed down photographing protocols is displayed, so that the operator selectively specifies a desired photographing protocol on the list. This makes it possible to advance an examination by switching to an adequate photographing protocol efficiently.

Thus, according to applicants' invention, a group of examination protocols that are prepared is distributed by specifying a region to be examined. If, therefore, options can be narrowed down to the least necessary parameter and photographing direction (photographing protocol) by merely choosing an examination protocol for a target region to be examined from a group of examination protocols which corresponds to the specified region to be examined, and an operator selectively specifies a parameter and a photographing direction (photographing protocol) that satisfy a desired condition from the least necessary parameter and photographing direction, the result is that efficient examination can be made.

In contrast, none of Banks, Tsunoda, Babula and Matsumoto discloses that a protocol includes set information corresponding to a region to be examined. For example, column 12, lines 5-22 and figure 2 of Tsunoda referenced in the Official Action is not believed to disclose this feature. However, the cited prior art references simply teach choosing set

information corresponding to a region to be examined for each protocol and none of the cited references teaches distributing all the recommended protocols corresponding to the specified region to be examined. Thus, none of the references teaches the claimed invention or the advantages derived by the claimed invention.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments, no further issues are believed to be outstanding, and the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

1093190\_1.DOC